

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Status of the Claims

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over 3GPP-TS-33-200 (3GPP TS 33.200 V5.0.0 Release 5 march 2002) in view of *Loganathan, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,536,183). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. The proposed *3GPP-Loganathan* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of the rejected claims.

For example, the proposed *3GPP-Loganathan* combination fails to disclose, teach, the proposed *3GPP-Loganathan* combination fails to disclose at least a gateway node being configured “to receive a mobile application part message from the first domain, to convert the received mobile application part message obtaining a secured mobile application part message, and . . . further being configured to receive a secured mobile application part message from the second domain, to extract an unsecured mobile application part message from the received secured mobile application part message” (emphasis added) as recited by claim 1. In attempting to address these elements of claim 1, the Office Action provides the assertion that “element 114” of *Loganathan* converts a MAP message to an allegedly more secured GSM MAP message. See Office Action at p. 5. However, the cited portion of *Loganathan* simply states that “the mobile application part protocol translator can be operative to receive a message in a TIA-41 mobile application part protocol and translate the message to a corresponding message in a GSM mobile application part protocol.” *Loganathan* at col. 4, ll. 49-53. This cited portion does not indicate anything about how secure either MAP or GSM MAP messages are. Thus, the Office Action provides no evidence to support the assertion that GSM MAP messages are more secure than MAP messages.

In response to Applicant's previously-submitted arguments, the Office Action states "Applicant's argument has no merit since the alleged limitation regarding exactly 'which part of the secured function/element and to what extent (or how secure) it is' has not been recited into the claim." *Office Action*, p. 2. First of all, Applicant respectfully contends that it is not trying to read limitations from the specification into the claims. The Office Action had equated converting a MAP message to a GSM MAP message read on "convert[ing] the received mobile application part message obtaining a secured mobile application part message," with no explanation of how the GSM MAP message was "secured." Applicant was merely making the point that *Loganathan* fails to disclose how its conversion process "obtain[s] a secured mobile application part message." Although the Office Action makes the statement that "the GSM is a truly secured protocol standard," (*Office Action*, p. 2), the Office Action does not point to any specific portions of the cited references to support this statement. As such, Applicant respectfully maintains that the proposed combination of references fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a mobile node configured to "convert the received mobile application part message obtaining a secured mobile application part message."

Furthermore, the Office Action rejects Applicant's arguments regarding the limitation "to extract an unsecured mobile application part message from the received secured mobile application part message." *Office Action*, p. 3. Specifically, the Office Action states "Examiner notes the decryption of the message is indeed extracting an unsecured (or clear) mobile application part message from the received secured (or encrypted) mobile application part message." *Office Action*, pg. 3. Without conceding the accuracy of this statement, Applicant respectfully points out that *Loganathan* completely fails to disclose anything about decryption. As such, Applicant respectfully contends that *Loganathan* fails to disclose a mobile node configured to "extract an unsecured mobile application part message from the received secured mobile application part message."

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully contends that *Loganathan* is completely silent regarding any secured or unsecured messages. Accordingly, the proposed 3GPP-*Loganathan* combination fails to disclose any gateway node configured

"to receive a mobile application part message from the first domain, to convert the received mobile application part message obtaining a secured mobile application part message, and . . . further being configured to receive a secured mobile application part message from the second domain, to extract an unsecured mobile application part message from the received secured mobile application part message" (emphasis added) as recited by claim 1.

As a result, the proposed *3GPP-Loganathan* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest every element of claim 1. Although of differing scope from claim 1, claim 6 includes elements that the cited references fail to disclose, teach, or suggest for reasons analogous to those discussed with respect to claim 1. Claims 1 and 6 are thus allowable for at least these reasons. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 6, and their respective dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian M. Kearns, Reg#62287/

Brian M. Kearns
Registration No. 62,287

Date: January 31, 2011

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-9447
brian.kearns@ericsson.com